

Question of Privilege

asking for the adjournment of the house. My understanding of the expert advice I have received, advice which is always very useful in such instances, is to the effect that this motion cannot be moved now.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I thought the business before the house was a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. I submit that whether or not the motion is in order the question is still there.

Mr. Speaker: It is not. I have to add that not only can it not be done under the guise of a point of order but it cannot be done under a question of privilege.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Surely Your Honour has looked at standing order 25 which reads:

A motion to adjourn (except when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance), shall always be in order—

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, "shall always be in order". The universal custom of this House of Commons is that a motion to adjourn can be received at any time, I submit with the greatest respect.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member should have read the rest of the standing order. It continues:

—but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been had.

I really do not want to argue with the hon. member. The Chair should not be placed in the position where it has to argue on a matter such as this. I suggest that whenever there is a substantive motion before the house at a later hour during the day that motion can be moved. My understanding is that it cannot be moved now. I hope I have been well advised on this.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, if the motion to adjourn is not in order, I should like to speak to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and I should like to move a motion in connection therewith.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has heard the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre make a motion. He has moved a motion and the Chair has asked for the assistance and for the concurrence of the house to allow the Chair some time to consider the motion, as well as the motion moved by the hon. member for Yukon. Surely the hon. member does not want to move a third motion on the same question of privilege.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, surely the question whether the motion is proper does not end the debate. The disposition of one motion does not end the question of privilege. I would put that suggestion before the house.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot agree with the hon. member. A question of privilege has been raised. The Chair rendered the decision that there was a prima facie case of privilege before the house, after which a motion was moved consequent upon the question of privilege. The only matter we can discuss now is the motion, if it is accepted by the house. The Chair has asked that the matter be held in abeyance. This is such a reasonable request that I would invite hon. members to grant it.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, my point is that if the motion had been disposed of that would have disposed of the question of privilege. But since the motion was found to be not acceptable it does not dispose of the question of privilege. Therefore the question of privilege is still before the house, as is the action to be taken on it. We have two questions of privilege which in my submission are still before the house, one raised by the hon. member for Calgary North and the other by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. The motion moved by the hon. member for Calgary North was found to be out of order but—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I cannot agree with the hon. member's contention. My contention is that two very logical questions of privilege have been raised followed by motions, one of which is under consideration. We cannot completely forget the fact that these motions exist and are now before the house. They were regular motions. Whether or not they are acceptable or should be ignored is the question which the Chair would like the opportunity to decide. But certainly motions have been moved and seconded in both instances. I do not think we can make an abstraction of them and return to the question of privilege and discuss it further.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that by finding the motion out of order you are killing off debate on the main subject? That practice could happen in the house at any time. A member could make a motion which is out of order so as to kill off debate. Certainly this does not dispose of the substantive question before us, and I wish to speak to that substantive question.